

SALIL BALI, State Bar No. 263001
sbali@stradlinglaw.com
STRADLING YOCCA CARLSON & RAUTH LLP
660 Newport Center Drive, Suite 1600
Newport Beach, CA 92660-6422
Telephone: 949.725.4000

ZIYONG SEAN LI, State Bar No. 289696
sli@beneschlaw.com
GREGORY CARL PROCTOR, State Bar No. 311214
gproctor@beneschlaw.com
HAYK SNKHCHYAN, State Bar No. 341698
hsnkhchyan@beneschlaw.com
BENESCH FRIEDLANDER COPLAN & ARONOFF LLP
100 Pine Street, Suite 3100
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: 628.600.2250

KAL K. SHAH (admitted *pro hac vice*)
kshah@beneschlaw.com
SIMEON G. PAPACOSTAS (admitted *pro hac vice*)
spapacostas@beneschlaw.com
BENESCH FRIEDLANDER COPLAN & ARONOFF LLP
71 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 1600
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: 312.212.4949

Attorneys for Defendant, Feit Electric Co., Inc.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

SEOUL SEMICONDUCTOR CO.,
LTD., a Korean corporation, SEOUL
VIOSYS CO., LTD., a Korean
corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FEIT ELECTRIC CO., INC.,
Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:22-cv-05097

Honorable Andre Birotte Jr
Magistrate Shashi H. Kewalramani

**DEFENDANT FEIT ELECTRIC CO.,
INC.'S APPLICATION TO FILE ITS
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE EXPERT
TESTIMONY OF DR. MICHAEL
LEBBY (AND EXHIBITS THERETO)
UNDER SEAL**

FAC Filed: December 21, 2022

TO PLAINTIFFS AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD

HEREIN:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE, that pursuant to Local Rule 79-5 and the Protective Order (Dkt. No.78) in the above-entitled action, Defendant Feit Electric Co., Inc. (“Feit Electric”) hereby applies to this Court for an order permitting it to file under seal its Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Exclude the Expert Testimony of Dr. Michael Lebby as well as documents supporting the Motion.

The following documents contain proprietary, commercially sensitive or competitive information, the entirety of which have been designated by Plaintiffs or Defendant as “CONFIDENTIAL” or “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY” information pursuant to the Protective Order (Dkt. 77). *See* concurrently filed Declaration of Simeon G. Papacostas (“Papacostas Decl.”) in support of Feit Electric’s Application for Leave to File Under Seal, ¶¶ 4-9. Specifically, Feit Electric seeks to file, under seal, true and correct unredacted copies of the following documents:

1. Feit Electric’s Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Exclude the Expert Testimony of Dr. Michael Lebby (the “Lebby *Daubert* Opposition”); and
2. Exhibit Nos. L2, L4, L6, and L7 to the Declaration of Gregory Proctor in Support of Feit Electric Co., Inc.’s Opposition.

Pursuant to L.R. 79-5.2.2(b), on February 5, 2025, counsel for Feit Electric reached out to Plaintiffs’ counsel and informed Plaintiffs’ counsel that certain documents and testimony discussed within Feit Electric’s Opposition and in the accompanying exhibits contained information designated as CONFIDENTIAL or HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL by Plaintiffs or Defendant pursuant to the parties’ Protective Order in this case (Dkt. 78) and indicated that Feit Electric would be filing that information under seal in order to prevent disclosure of Plaintiffs’ or Defendant’s confidential information. *See* Papacostas Decl., ¶ 10. Feit Electric

1 requested that Plaintiffs indicate whether they opposed filing that material under
2 seal. Plaintiffs responded, noting their non-opposition to this Application. *Id.*

3 **GOOD CAUSE EXISTS TO GRANT THIS APPLICATION**

4 A court has supervisory powers over its records and files to seal documents
5 under appropriate circumstances. *Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns., Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589,
6 598 (1978). Two standards generally govern motions to seal documents,
7 compelling reasons or good cause. The standard to be applied depends on whether
8 the motion is “more than tangentially related to the merits of a case.” *Ctr. For*
9 *Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096 (9th Cir. 2016). Where
10 a motion pertains to the merits of a case, courts apply a “compelling reasons”
11 standard. *Id.* at 1096-97. The Court’s Initial Standing Order provides that “[f]or
12 each document or other type of information a party seeks to file under seal, the
13 party must identify and discuss the factual and/or legal justification that
14 establishes ‘good cause’ or ‘compelling reasons’ for the matter should be
15 protected. Dkt. 19 at 10:26–11:2 (citing *Kamakana v. City and County of*
16 *Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179–80 (9th Cir. 2006)). Relevant factors include the
17 “public interest in understanding the judicial process and whether disclosure of
18 the material could result in improper use of material for scandalous or libelous
19 purposes or infringement upon trade secrets.” *Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass’n*, 605
20 F.3d 665, 679, n.6 (9th Cir. 2010). As explained below, there are compelling
21 reasons to seal the documents identified above.

22 Under Central District of California Local Rule 79-5, documents may be
23 filed under seal after obtaining approval of the Court. Documents containing
24 confidential, valuable, and non-public information that would cause competitive
25 injury to a party if publicly disclosed, are subject to protection under Rule 26(c).
26 *See Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elec. Co.*, 727 F.3d 1214, 1221 (Fed. Cir. 2013)
27 (sealing documents is appropriate if “release of the documents will cause
28 competitive harm to a business”).

1 Here, the documents discussed above have been designated confidential by
2 Plaintiffs or Defendant. Papacostas Decl. at ¶¶ 4-9. It is Feit Electric's
3 understanding that Plaintiffs believe the information designated by Plaintiffs as
4 CONFIDENTIAL or HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL contained therein has not been
5 previously made public, and that the disclosure of this competitively sensitive
6 information could be used by third parties to the parties' detriment. *Id.* The
7 information designated by Feit Electric as CONFIDENTIAL or HIGHLY
8 CONFIDENTIAL contained therein has not been previously made public, and it
9 is Feit Electric's understanding that the disclosure of this competitively sensitive
10 information could be used by third parties to its detriment. *Id.* at ¶¶ 5-7.

11 Accordingly, Feit Electric submits that there exist compelling reasons to
12 overcome the right of public access to the unredacted versions of these documents
13 because they contain proprietary, commercially sensitive, or competitive
14 information of Plaintiffs or Defendant, thus there is good cause to file the
15 documents under seal.

16 If this Application is denied, counsel requests that the Courtroom Deputy
17 Clerk destroy the Chambers' copies of the documents.

18 DATED: February 6, 2025 STRADLING YOCCA
19 CARLSON & RAUTH LLP

20 By: /s/ Salil Bali
21 Salil Bali

22 BENESCH FRIEDLANDER
23 COPLAN & ARONOFF LLP

24 Kal K. Shah
25 Ziyong Sean Li
26 Gregory Carl Proctor
27 Simeon G. Papacostas
28 Hayk Snkhchyan

*Attorneys for Defendant
Feit Electric Company, Inc.*